Verma modules over a class of Block type Lie algebras *

Qiufan Chen†, Jianzhi Han‡
† Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Maritime University, Shanghai 201306, China
‡ School of Mathematical Sciences, Tongji University, Shanghai 200092, China

Abstract: Irreducibilities of Verma modules over a class of Block type Lie algebras are completely determined. The approach developed in the present paper can be used to deal with non-weight modules.

Key words: Verma module, irreducibility, Block type Lie algebra
Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 17B10, 17B65, 17B68.

arXiv:1607.04717v1 [math.QA] 16 Jul 2016

1 Introduction

A class of infinite-dimensional simple Lie algebras was introduced by R. Block [1]. Generalizations of Block algebras, usually referred to as *Block type Lie algebras*, partially because of which are closely related to the Virasoro algebra, Virasoro-like algebra, or special cases of (generalized) Cartan type S Lie algerbas or Cartan type H Lie algerbas [9], have been extensively studied (cf. [3, 7, 8]). In this paper, we are interested in the representation theory for a class of Block type Lie algebras.

Let G be an abelian group, $\mathbb{F}$ a field of characteristic 0, $\mu : G \to \mathbb{F}$ an additive map, and $\varphi : G \times G \to \mathbb{F}$ a bilinear skew-symmetric map. A Block type Lie algebra [2] is by definition a vector space L with basis $\{L_x, x \in G\}$ and the following brackets:

$$[L_x, L_y] = \big(\varphi(x,y) + \mu(x-y)\big)L_{x+y}, \quad \forall x, y \in G.$$

Taking G to be the product $\Gamma \times \Delta$ of two nonzero additive subgroups Γ and Δ of $\mathbb{F}$ and $(p,q) \in \mathbb{F}^2$, define $\mu(\alpha, a) = pa - q\alpha$ and $\varphi\big((\alpha,a),(\beta,b)\big) = \beta a - \alpha b$ for any $(\alpha,a),(\beta,b) \in \Gamma \times \Delta$. Then we get a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{B}(\Gamma, \Delta, p, q)$ with basis $\{L_{\alpha,a} \,|\, (\alpha,a) \in \Gamma \times \Delta\}$ subject to the following relations:

$$[L_{\alpha,a}, L_{\beta,b}] = \big((\beta+p)(a+q) - (\alpha+p)(b+q)\big)L_{\alpha+\beta,a+b}, \ \forall (\alpha,a),(\beta,b) \in \Gamma \times \Delta.$$

Note that the center of $\mathfrak{B}(\Gamma, \Delta, p, q)$ is

$$Z(\mathfrak{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F}L_{-p,-q} & \text{if } (-p,-q) \in \Gamma \times \Delta, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The object of study is the *Block type Lie algebra*

$$\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q) := [\mathfrak{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q), \mathfrak{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)]/Z(\mathfrak{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q))$$

* Supported by NSF grant Nos. 11371278, 11431010, 11501417, the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities of China, Innovation Program of Shanghai Municipal Education Commission and Program for Young Excellent Talents in Tongji University.
‡ Corresponding author: J. Han(jzhan@tongji.edu.cn)

with basis $\{L_{\alpha,a} \,|\, (\alpha,a) \in \widetilde{\Gamma\times\Delta}\}$, where

$$\widetilde{\Gamma\times\Delta} = \begin{cases} (\Gamma\times\Delta)\setminus\{(-p,-q),(-2p,-2q)\} & \text{if } p\in\Gamma, \\ (\Gamma\times\Delta)\setminus\{(-2p,-2q)\} & \text{if } p\notin\Gamma, 2p\in\Gamma, \\ \Gamma\times\Delta & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here we restrict q to be in Δ and use the same notation $L_{\alpha,a}$ to denote its coset in the quotient space. $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$ can also be obtained by extending the basis $\{\, L_{\alpha,i} \mid (\alpha,i)\in\Gamma\times\mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1}\}$ of the Lie algebra B [7] satisfying relations $[L_{\alpha,i},L_{\beta,j}] = (\beta(i+1)-\alpha(j+1))L_{\alpha+\beta,i+j}$ to the basis indexed by $\Gamma\times\Delta$ and replacing 0 by p and 1 by q in the defining relations. Note that a class of (centerless) Block type Lie algebras $\mathrm{B}(q)$ (cf. [6]) is, in fact, a half part of $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z},\mathbb{Z},0,q)$ and that the so-called generalized (centerless) Virasoro algebra

$$\mathrm{Vir}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{span}\{L_{\alpha,0} \,|\, \alpha\in\Gamma\}$$

is contained in $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)(q\neq 0)$ as a subalgebra.

The unique (up to a scalar multiplicative factor) semisimple element is $L_{0,0}$, but the gradation of $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$ with respect to $L_{0,0}$ is too coarse to distinguish basis elements via their eigenvalues. In view of this, it becomes nontrivial to study the representation theory of $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$. In this paper, we shall study Verma modules over $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$, which are not weight modules in general. After introducing a total order "$\succ$" on Γ we define a class of Verma $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$-modules $M(\Lambda,\succ)$. The aim of this paper is to give the equivalent conditions of these Verma modules being irreducible. A reduced method is adopted in [5] to deal with weight modules, namely, the irreducibility of a Verma module is reduced to that of the Verma module over some of its "integral" subalgebra in the case of discrete order and the length of some weight vector is reduced to 1 in the case of dense order. This method also works for our case by making full use of certain "filtrations" (see Proposition 2.1 and Theorem 3.1). This technique provides a way to study irreducibilities of non-weight modules.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some basic notions, especially we define Verma modules over $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$. Besides, for any $\tau\in\Gamma_+$, a useful proposition is given to characterise the irreducibility of the Verma $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z}\tau,\Delta,p,q)$-module $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$. In Section 3, we generalize the techniques developed in [7] to non-weight modules and completely determine the irreducibility of the Verma modules over $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$.

Throughout the paper, we denote by $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{Z}_+$ the sets of integers, positive integers and non-negative integers, respectively.

2 Preliminaries

Observe easily that $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$ is Γ-graded

$$\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q) = \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Gamma}\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)_\alpha, \quad \mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)_\alpha = \mathrm{span}\{L_{\alpha,a} \,|\, a\in\Delta\} \text{ for } \alpha\in\Gamma.$$

For a total order "$\succ$" on Γ compatible with its group structure, $\Gamma=\Gamma_+\cup\{0\}\cup\Gamma_-$ with $\Gamma_\pm=\{\alpha\in\Gamma\,|\,\pm\alpha\succ 0\}$. Denote

$$\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)_\pm=\oplus_{\pm\alpha\succ 0}\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)_\alpha.$$

Then $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$ admits the triangular decomposition

$$\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)=\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)_+\oplus\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)_0\oplus\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)_-.$$

Also, fix a total order "$\succ$" on Δ compatible with its group structure (no confusion should arise here when the same symbol "$\succ$" is used to denote the total orders on Γ and Δ). Given any

$$\underline{\alpha}=(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_r),\ \underline{\alpha}'=(\underline{\alpha}'_1,\dots,\underline{\alpha}'_r)\in\Gamma_+^r \text{ and } \underline{a}=(a_1,\dots,a_r),\ \underline{a}'=(\underline{a}'_1,\dots,\underline{a}'_r)\in\Delta^r,$$

define

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\alpha}\succ\underline{\alpha}' &\iff \exists s\in\{1,\dots,r\} \text{ such that } \alpha_s\succ\alpha'_s \text{ and } \alpha_t=\alpha'_t \text{ for } t>s.\\ \underline{a}\succ\underline{a}' &\iff \exists s\in\{1,\dots,r\} \text{ such that } a_s\succ a'_s \text{ and } a_t=a'_t \text{ for } t>s.\end{aligned}$$

Then $\Gamma_+^r\times\Delta^r$ carries a natural total order:

$$(\underline{\alpha},\underline{a})\succ(\underline{\alpha}',\underline{a}')\Longleftrightarrow\underline{\alpha}\succ\underline{\alpha}' \text{ or } \underline{\alpha}=\underline{\alpha}',\ \underline{a}\succ\underline{a}',\quad\forall\,(\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}),(\underline{\alpha}',\underline{a}')\in\Gamma_+^r\times\Delta^r,$$

which is also compatible with its addition operator.

We use $U\big(\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)\big)$ to denote the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$. Given any $\Lambda\in\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)_0^*$, the dual space of $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)_0$, let $I(\Lambda,\succ)$ be the left ideal of $U\big(\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)\big)$ generated by the following elements

$$\{L_{\alpha,a}\mid(\alpha,a)\in\Gamma_+\times\Delta\}\cup\{h-\Lambda(h)\cdot 1\mid h\in\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)_0\}.$$

Then the *Verma* $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$*-module* with respect to the order "$\succ$" is defined as

$$M(\Lambda,\succ)=U(\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q))/I(\Lambda,\succ).$$

By the PBW theorem, $M(\Lambda,\succ)$ has a basis $\mathscr{B}$ consisting of all vectors of the form

$$L_{-\alpha_1,a_1}L_{-\alpha_2,a_2}\cdots L_{-\alpha_r,a_r}v_\Lambda,\quad(\alpha_s,a_s)\in\Gamma_+\times\Delta,\tag{2.1}$$

where v_Λ is the coset of 1 in $M(\Lambda,\succ)$, $r\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ and $(\alpha_s,a_s)\preceq(\alpha_{s+1},a_{s+1})$ for all $s=1,\dots,r-1$. Set

$$\mathscr{L}(L_{-\alpha_1,a_1}L_{-\alpha_2,a_2}\cdots L_{-\alpha_r,a_r}v_\Lambda)=r\ \text{ (called the } \textit{length} \text{ of } L_{-\alpha_1,a_1}L_{-\alpha_2,a_2}\cdots L_{-\alpha_r,a_r}v_\Lambda).$$

It is important to observe that the set $\{v\in\mathscr{B}\mid\mathscr{L}(v)=r\}$ inherits a total order from $\Gamma_+^r\times\Delta^r$ in the following sense:

$$L_{-\alpha_1,a_1}L_{-\alpha_2,a_2}\cdots L_{-\alpha_r,a_r}v_\Lambda\succ L_{-\alpha'_1,a'_1}L_{-\alpha'_2,a'_2}\cdots L_{-\alpha'_r,a'_r}v_\Lambda\Longleftrightarrow(\underline{\alpha},\underline{a})\succ(\underline{\alpha}',\underline{a}'),$$

where $(\underline{\alpha},\underline{a})=(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_r,a_1,\dots,a_r),(\underline{\alpha}',\underline{a}')=(\underline{\alpha}'_1,\dots,\underline{\alpha}'_r,\underline{a}'_1,\dots,\underline{a}'_r)\in\Gamma_+^r\times\Delta^r$. For each $r\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, denote

$$H_r=\mathrm{span}\{v\in\mathscr{B}\mid\mathscr{L}(v)=r\}\quad\text{and}\quad V_r=\oplus_{i=0}^r H_i.$$

It is easy to see that $L_{\alpha,a}V_r\subseteq V_r$ for any $(\alpha,a)\in\Gamma_+\times\Delta$. Take $0\neq u=\sum\limits_{i=1}^n f_iu_i\in M(\Lambda,\succ)$ for some $f_i\in\mathbb{F}$ and $u_i\in\mathscr{B}$. Clearly, $u\in V_s\setminus V_{s-1}$ for some $s\in\mathbb{Z}_+$. Set

$$\mathrm{Supp}\,(u)=\{u_i\in H_s\mid f_i\neq 0,i=1,\dots,n\}\ \text{(called the \textit{support} of u)}.$$

We define the *leading term* $\mathrm{lt}(u)$ of u as $f_{i_0}u_{i_0}$ if $\max\mathrm{Supp}\,(u)=u_{i_0}$.

Note that $M(\Lambda,\succ)=\oplus_{\alpha\preceq 0}M(\Lambda,\succ)_\alpha$ is a Γ-graded $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$-module, where $M(\Lambda,\succ)_0=\mathbb{F}v_\Lambda$ and $M(\Lambda,\succ)_\alpha$ is spanned by $L_{-\alpha_1,a_1}L_{-\alpha_2,a_2}\cdots L_{-\alpha_k,a_k}v_\Lambda\in\mathscr{B}$ with $\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\cdots+\alpha_k=-\alpha$ for any $\alpha\in\Gamma_-$. We call a nonzero vector $u\in M(\Lambda,\succ)_\alpha$ a *weight vector* with *weight* $\mathrm{wt}(u)=\alpha$, even though $M(\Lambda,\succ)$ might not be a weight module.

For any $\tau\in\Gamma_+$, denote by $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z}\tau,\Delta,p,q)=\mathrm{span}\{L_{n\tau,a}\mid n\in\mathbb{Z},a\in\Delta\}$ a subalgebra of $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$ and by $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$ the $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z}\tau,\Delta,p,q)$-submodule of $M(\Lambda,\succ)$ generated by v_Λ, respectively. The irreducibility of $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$ can be characterised in the following way.

Proposition 2.1. *The Verma $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z}\tau,\Delta,p,q)$-module $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$ is irreducible if and only if*

$$\{u\in H_1\cap M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)\mid L_{\tau,k}u=0,\forall k\in\Delta\}=0.$$

Proof. Suppose that there exists $0\neq u\in H_1\cap M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$ such that $L_{\tau,k}u=0$ for any $k\in\Delta$. Then $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z}\tau,\Delta,p,q)_+u=0$, since $\{L_{\tau,k}\mid k\in\Delta\}$ generates $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z}\tau,\Delta,p,q)_+$. It follows that $v_\Lambda\notin\oplus_{i\geq 1}H_i\supseteq U\big(\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z}\tau,\Delta,p,q)_-\big)u\cong U\big(\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z}\tau,\Delta,p,q)\big)u$. Thus, $U\big(\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z}\tau,\Delta,p,q)\big)u$ is a proper submodule of $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$ and therefore $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$ is reducible.

Conversely, the idea is essentially from [4, Theorem 6.5]. But for our case a little modification is needed, since modules considered here are not weighted in general. For this, we introduce a family of subspaces of $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$. To be explicit, for any $(l,w)\in\mathbb{Z}_+\times\mathbb{Z}_+$, define

$$V(l,w)=\bigoplus_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\in\mathscr{B}(M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ))\\ \mathscr{L}(\mathfrak{b})\leq l,\mathrm{wt}(\mathfrak{b})\leq -w\tau}}\mathbb{F}\mathfrak{b}.$$

Suppose on the contrary that $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$ is reducible. Let W be any nonzero submodule of $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$. Take $(l_0,w_0)\in\mathbb{Z}_+\times\mathbb{Z}_+$ minimal ($(l,w)<(l',w')\Longleftrightarrow l<l'$ or $l=l',w<w'$) such that $W\cap V(l_0,w_0)\neq 0$ and take $0\neq v\in W\cap V(l_0,w_0)$. It is clear from the definitions of length and weight that $w_0\geq l_0$. In fact, $w_0=l_0$. Suppose not, then the leading term of v has the form $L_{-\tau,a_1}\cdots L_{-\tau,a_{r-1}}L_{-i_r\tau,a_r}\cdots L_{-i_{l_0}\tau,a_{l_0}}v_\Lambda$ with $i_r\geq 2$. On the one hand, by choosing some $a_0\in\Delta$ such that $(p-i_r\tau)(a_0+q)\neq(\tau+p)(a_r+q)$ we have

$$0\neq\mathrm{lt}\,(L_{\tau,a_0}v)\in\mathbb{F}L_{-\tau,a_1}\cdots L_{-\tau,a_{r-1}}L_{-(i_r-1)\tau,a_r+a_0}\cdots L_{-i_{l_0}\tau,a_{l_0}}v_\Lambda,$$

but on the other hand, $L_{\tau,a_0}v \in V(l_0, w_0-1)$, contradicting the choice of (l_0, w_0). Write

$$v = \sum_{i=1}^{r} f_i v_i + \sum_{i=r+1}^{n} f_i v_i + \tilde{v} + \overline{v},$$

where $v_i \in \mathrm{Supp}(v) \cap M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)_{-l_0\tau} (1 \le i \le r)$ such that $\min \mathrm{Supp}\,(v) = v_1$, $v_i \in \mathscr{B}\big(M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)\big) \cap H_{l_0-1} \cap M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)_{-l_0\tau}$ for $r+1 \le i \le n$, $\tilde{v} \in (H_{l_0} \oplus H_{l_0-1}) \cap \oplus_{\alpha \prec -l_0\tau} M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)_\alpha$ and $\overline{v} \in V_{l_0-2}$. Assume that for $1 \le i \le r$, each v_i is of the form $v_i = L_{-\tau,b_{i,1}} L_{-\tau,b_{i,2}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,l_0}} v_\Lambda$. For any $k \in \Delta$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
& L_{\tau,k} v_i \\
= \;& [L_{\tau,k}, L_{-\tau,b_{i,1}} L_{-\tau,b_{i,2}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,l_0}}] v_\Lambda \\
= \;& \sum_{d=1}^{l_0} L_{-\tau,b_{i,1}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,d-1}} [L_{\tau,k}, L_{-\tau,b_{i,d}}] L_{-\tau,b_{i,d+1}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,l_0}} v_\Lambda \\
\equiv \;& \sum_{d=1}^{l_0} \Lambda([L_{\tau,k}, L_{-\tau,b_{i,d}}]) L_{-\tau,b_{i,1}} \cdots \widehat{L_{-\tau,b_{i,d-1}} L_{-\tau,b_{i,d}}} L_{-\tau,b_{i,d+1}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,l_0}} v_\Lambda + \sum_{d=1}^{l_0} \sum_{e=d+1}^{l_0} x_{i,e,d}(k) \\
& L_{-\tau,b_{i,1}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,d-1}} \widehat{L_{-\tau,b_{i,d}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,e}}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,l_0}} L_{-\tau,b_{i,d}+b_{i,e}+k} v_\Lambda \pmod{V_{l_0-2}}, \qquad (2.2)
\end{aligned}$$

where " $\widehat{\ }$ " means deleting the factor and $x_{i,e,d}(k)$ $(i = 1, \ldots, r)$ are polynomial functions defined by

$$\big[[L_{\tau,k}, L_{-\tau,b_{i,d}}], L_{-\tau,b_{i,e}}\big] = x_{i,e,d}(k) L_{-\tau,b_{i,d}+b_{i,e}+k}, \quad \forall k \in \Delta.$$

For $r+1 \le i \le n$, each v_i is of the form $v_i = L_{-\tau,b_{i,1}} L_{-\tau,b_{i,2}} \cdots L_{-2\tau,b_{i,l_0-1}} v_\Lambda$. And we have

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{\tau,k} v_i \;&=\; [L_{\tau,k}, L_{-\tau,b_{i,1}} L_{-\tau,b_{i,2}} \cdots L_{-2\tau,b_{i,l_0-1}}] v_\Lambda \\
&\equiv\; x_i(k) L_{-\tau,b_{i,1}} L_{-\tau,b_{i,2}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,l_0-1}+k} v_\Lambda \pmod{V_{l_0-2}}, \qquad (2.3)
\end{aligned}$$

where $x_i(k)$ are polynomial functions defined by

$$[L_{\tau,k}, L_{-2\tau,b_{i,l_0-1}}] = x_i(k) L_{-\tau,b_{i,l_0-1}+k}, \quad \forall k \in \Delta.$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
w_1(k) \;=\; & \sum_{i=1}^{r} f_i \sum_{d=1}^{l_0} \Lambda([L_{\tau,k}, L_{-\tau,b_{i,d}}]) L_{-\tau,b_{i,1}} \cdots \widehat{L_{-\tau,b_{i,d-1}} L_{-\tau,b_{i,d}}} L_{-\tau,b_{i,d+1}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,l_0}} v_\Lambda \quad \text{and} \\
w_2(k) \;=\; & \sum_{i=1}^{r} f_i \sum_{d=1}^{l_0} \sum_{e=d+1}^{l_0} x_{i,e,d}(k) L_{-\tau,b_{i,1}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,d-1}} \widehat{L_{-\tau,b_{i,d}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,e}}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,l_0}} L_{-\tau,b_{i,d}+b_{i,e}+k} v_\Lambda \\
& + \sum_{i=r+1}^{n} f_i x_i(k) L_{-\tau,b_{i,1}} L_{-\tau,b_{i,2}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{i,l_0-1}+k} v_\Lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Rewrite $w_2(k)$ as

$$\sum_{\underline{l}} x_{\underline{l}}(k) L_{-\tau,l_1} L_{-\tau,l_2} \cdots L_{-\tau,l_{l_0-2}} L_{-\tau,l_{l_0-1}+k} v_\Lambda,$$

where $x_{\underline{l}}(k)$ are polynomial functions in k. Then it follows from the choice of v, (2.2) and (2.3) that for all $k \in \Delta$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= L_{\tau,k} v = \sum_{i=1}^{r} f_i L_{\tau,k} v_i + \sum_{i=r+1}^{n} f_i L_{\tau,k} v_i + L_{\tau,k} \tilde{v} + L_{\tau,k} \overline{v} \\ &\equiv w_1(k) + w_2(k) + w_3(k) + w_4(k) \pmod{V_{l_0-2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $w_3(k) \in H_{l_0-1}$, $w_4(k) \in H_{l_0}$ such that $L_{\tau,k}\tilde{v} \equiv w_3(k) + w_4(k) \pmod{V_{l_0-2}}$. Then we must have $w_1(k) + w_2(k) + w_3(k) = 0$, since $w_j(k) \in H_{l_0-1}$ for $j = 1,2,3$. Furthermore, $w_3(k) = 0$ since the weight of $w_3(k)$ is different from that of $w_1(k) + w_2(k)$. Thus, $w_1(k) + w_2(k) = 0$. It is important to observe that $w_1(k)$ and $w_2(k)$ are linearly independent whenever k is large enough. So in particular, $x_{\underline{l}} = 0$, i.e., $w_2(k) = 0$, which in turn forces $w_1(k) = 0$ for all $k \in \Delta$. This implies the coefficient of $L_{-\tau,b_{1,1}} L_{-\tau,b_{1,2}} \cdots L_{-\tau,b_{1,l_0-1}} v_\Lambda$ should be zero, i.e.,

$$\sum_{i \in I} r_i f_i \Lambda([L_{\tau,k}, L_{-\tau,b_{i,l_0}}]) = 0, \quad \forall k \in \Delta,$$

where $I = \{1 \le i \le r \mid b_{i,t} = b_{1,t}, \forall 1 \le t \le t_0 - 1\}$ and $r_i = \sharp\{1 \le j \le l_0 \mid b_{i,j} = b_{i,l_0}\}$. Then the vector $\sum_{i \in I} r_i f_i L_{-\tau,b_{i,l_0}} v_\Lambda$ lies in $\{u \in H_1 \cap M_\tau(\Lambda, \succ) \mid L_{\tau,k} u = 0, \forall k \in \Delta\}$ and is nonzero since $r_1 f_1 \neq 0$. This completes the proposition. □

3 Main result

For a given order "$\succ$" on Γ, set $\Phi(\alpha) = \{\beta \in \Gamma \mid 0 \prec \beta \prec \alpha\}$ for $\alpha \in \Gamma_+$. The order "$\succ$" is called *dense* if $\Phi(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$ for all $\alpha \in \Gamma_+$ and otherwise, *discrete* if $\Phi(\tau) = \emptyset$ for some $\tau \in \Gamma_+$. The aim of this paper is to find out the necessary and sufficient conditions for the Verma $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma, \Delta, p, q)$-module $M(\Lambda, \succ)$ to be irreducible.

Theorem 3.1. *(i) With respect to a discrete order "$\succ$" of Γ, the Verma $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma, \Delta, p, q)$-module $M(\Lambda, \succ)$ is irreducible if and only if*

$$\{u \in H_1 \cap M_\tau(\Lambda, \succ) \mid L_{\tau,k} u = 0, \forall k \in \Delta\} = 0,$$

where $\tau = \min\{\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Gamma_+\}$.

(ii) With respect to a dense order "$\succ$" of Γ, the Verma $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma, \Delta, p, q)$-module $M(\Lambda, \succ)$ is irreducible if and only if $\Lambda \neq 0$. Moreover, in the case $\Lambda = 0$, the unique maximal proper submodule

$$M'(0, \succ) = \sum_{\substack{k \ge 1 \\ 0 \prec (\alpha_1, a_1) \preceq \cdots \preceq (\alpha_k, a_k)}} \mathbb{F} L_{-\alpha_1, a_1} \cdots L_{-\alpha_k, a_k} v_0$$

of $M(0,\succ)$ is irreducible if and only if for any $x,y\in\Gamma_+$, there exists a positive integer n such that $nx\succ y$.

Proof. (i) Suppose that the order "$\succ$" is discrete. Then $\Gamma=\mathbb{Z}\tau\cup H_+\cup H_-$, where $H_\pm=\{\alpha\in\Gamma\mid \pm a\succ\mathbb{Z}\tau\}$. Suppose that $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$ is reducible. Let S be a nonzero proper $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z}\tau,\Delta,p,q)$-submodule of $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$. Consider the $U(\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q))$-submodule W generated by S. Note by PBW theorem and the fact $U(\mathrm{B}(H_+,\Delta,p,q))S=0$ derived from the definition of H_+ that

$$\begin{aligned} W &= U\big(\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)\big)S\\ &\cong U(\mathrm{B}(H_-,\Delta,p,q))U(\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z}\tau,\Delta,p,q))U(\mathrm{B}(H_+,\Delta,p,q))S\\ &\cong U(\mathrm{B}(H_-,\Delta,p,q))S. \end{aligned}$$

Then W is proper, since $v_\Lambda\notin W$. This shows the reducibility of $M(\Lambda,\succ)$. Thus, we have established that the irreducibility of $M(\Lambda,\succ)$ implies that of $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$.

Conversely, we show that the irreducibility of $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$ implies that of $M(\Lambda,\succ)$. Let W be any nonzero $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$-submodule of $M(\Lambda,\succ)$. It is enough to show $W\cap M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)\neq 0$. Take $r\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ be minimal such that $W\cap V_r\neq 0$. Choose any $0\neq y\in W\cap V_r$. Now it follows from the approach used in [5] (see also [7]), i.e., by repeatedly applying some $L_{h,k}$ $(h\in H_+)$ to y, that we can get $w=y_r+\overline{y}\in U\big(\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)\big)y$ with $0\neq y_r\in M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)\cap H_r$ and $\overline{y}\in V_{r-1}$. We are done if $\overline{y}\in M_\tau(\lambda,\succ)$. Otherwise, choosing $h'\in H_+$ and $k'\in\Delta$ and by using the approach again we may assume that $L_{h',k'}\overline{y}\neq 0$. Then $L_{h',k'}w=L_{h',k'}\overline{y}$, since $L_{h',k'}M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)=0$. Whence $0\neq L_{h',k'}\overline{y}\in W\cap V_{r-1}$, contradicting the minimality of r. To sum up, we have proved that the $\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)$-module $M(\Lambda,\succ)$ is irreducible if and only if the $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{Z}\tau,\Delta,p,q)$-module $M_\tau(\Lambda,\succ)$ is irreducible. Then (i) follows from Proposition 2.1.

(ii) Let us consider the case in which the order "$\succ$" is dense. Let S be any nonzero submodule of $M(\Lambda,\succ)$. Take $r\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ minimal such that $0\neq S\cap V_r$.

Claim 1. *There exists some $0\neq v\in S$ such that*

$$v\equiv\sum_{\underline{k}=(k_1,\dots,k_r)\in\Delta^r} f_{\underline{k}}L_{-\varepsilon_1,k_1}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r,k_r}v_\Lambda \pmod{V_{r-1}},$$

where $0\prec\varepsilon_1\prec\cdots\prec\varepsilon_r$ and $f_{\underline{k}}\in\mathbb{F}$.

Choose any $0\neq u\in S\cap V_r$ and write

$$u\equiv\sum_{\substack{(\underline{\alpha},\underline{a})\in\Gamma_+^r\times\Delta^r\\ 0\prec(\alpha_1,a_1)\preceq(\alpha_2,a_2)\preceq\cdots\preceq(\alpha_r,a_r)}} f_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}}L_{-\alpha_1,a_1}L_{-\alpha_2,a_2}\cdots L_{-\alpha_r,a_r}v_\Lambda \pmod{V_{r-1}} \text{ for some } f_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}}\in\mathbb{F}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $r>1$, since it can be treated in a similar but simpler way for the case $r=1$. Denote

$$I=\{(\underline{\alpha},\underline{a})=(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_r,a_1,\dots,a_r)\in\Gamma_+^r\times\Delta^r\mid f_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}}\neq 0\}$$
$$\text{and}\quad \gamma_1=\max\{\alpha_r\mid(\underline{\alpha},\underline{a})\in I\}.$$

Since "$\succ$" is dense, there exists some $\varepsilon_1 \in \Gamma_+$ such that

$$\varepsilon_1 \prec \min\{\alpha_1 \mid (\underline{\alpha}, \underline{a}) \in I\}$$

$$\text{and} \quad \{x \in \Gamma_+ \mid \gamma_1 - \varepsilon_1 \prec x \prec \gamma_1\} \cap \{\alpha_r, \alpha_{r-1} \mid (\underline{\alpha}, \underline{a}) \in I\} = \emptyset.$$

Note that the choice of ε_1 forces $\gamma_1 - \varepsilon_1 - \alpha_k \succ 0$ if $\alpha_k \neq \gamma_1, k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. For any $k_1' \in \Delta$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
u_0 &:= L_{\gamma_1 - \varepsilon_1, k_1'} u \\
&\equiv \sum_{(\underline{\alpha}, \underline{a}) \in I} f_{\underline{\alpha}, \underline{a}} L_{\gamma_1 - \varepsilon_1, k_1'} L_{-\alpha_1, a_1} \cdots L_{-\alpha_r, a_r} v_\Lambda \pmod{V_{r-1}} \\
&\equiv \sum_{(\underline{\alpha}, \underline{a}) \in I'} \sum_{l = s_{\underline{\alpha}}}^{r} f_{\underline{\alpha}, \underline{a}} L_{-\alpha_1, a_1} \cdots L_{-\alpha_{s_{\underline{\alpha}}-1}, a_{s_{\underline{\alpha}}-1}} L_{-\gamma_1, a_{s_{\underline{\alpha}}}} \cdots [L_{\gamma_1 - \varepsilon_1, k_1'}, L_{-\gamma_1, a_l}] \cdots L_{-\gamma_1, a_r} v_\Lambda \pmod{V_{r-1}} \\
&\equiv \sum_{(\underline{\alpha}, \underline{a}) \in I'} \sum_{l = s_{\underline{\alpha}}}^{r} f'_{\underline{\alpha}, \underline{a}} L_{-\varepsilon_1, k_1' + a_l} L_{-\alpha_1, a_1} \cdots L_{-\gamma_1, a_{s_{\underline{\alpha}}}} \cdots \widehat{L_{-\gamma_1, a_l}} \cdots L_{-\gamma_1, a_r} v_\Lambda \pmod{V_{r-1}}, \qquad (3.1)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I' &= \{(\underline{\alpha}, \underline{a}) \in I \mid \exists 1 \leq s_{\underline{\alpha}} \leq r \text{ such that } \alpha_{s_{\underline{\alpha}}-1} \prec \gamma_1, \alpha_{s_{\underline{\alpha}}} = \alpha_{s_{\underline{\alpha}}+1} = \cdots = \alpha_r = \gamma_1\} \\
&\text{and} \quad f'_{\underline{\alpha}, \underline{a}} = (r - s_{\underline{\alpha}} + 1) f_{\underline{\alpha}, \underline{a}} \big((p - \gamma_1)(k_1' + q) - (\gamma_1 - \varepsilon_1 + p)(a_l + q)\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the terms

$$L_{-\varepsilon_1, k_1' + a_l} L_{-\alpha_1, a_1} \cdots L_{-\gamma_1, a_{s_{\underline{\alpha}}}} \cdots \widehat{L_{-\gamma_1, a_l}} \cdots L_{-\gamma_1, a_r} v_\Lambda$$

occur in (3.1) all have the standard form as in (2.1) and therefore are linearly independent. Hence by choosing suitable k_1' we know the resulting vector $u_0 \neq 0$. It is worthwhile to point out that both choices of ε_1 and k_1' are infinite. Repeating the preceding procedure we see that there exist $(\gamma_2, \ldots, \gamma_r) \in \Gamma_+^{r-1}$, $(k_2', \ldots, k_r') \in \Delta^{r-1}$ and $0 \prec \varepsilon_2 \prec \cdots \prec \varepsilon_r$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\neq L_{\gamma_r - \varepsilon_r, k_r'} \cdots L_{\gamma_2 - \varepsilon_2, k_2'} u_0 \\
&\equiv \sum_{\underline{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_r) \in \Delta^r} f_{\underline{k}} L_{-\varepsilon_1, k_1} L_{-\varepsilon_2, k_2} \cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r, k_r} v_\Lambda \pmod{V_{r-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, ε_2 can be chosen to satisfy $\varepsilon_1 \prec \varepsilon_2$. So the Claim 1 is true.

Claim 2. *There exists some $0 \neq w \in S$ such that*

$$w \equiv L_{-\varepsilon_1, k_1} \cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r, k_r} v_\Lambda \pmod{V_{r-1}},$$

where $0 \prec \varepsilon_1 \prec \cdots \prec \varepsilon_r$ and $(k_1, \ldots, k_r) \in (\Delta \setminus \{-q\})^r$.

Choose

$$0 \neq w \equiv \sum_{\underline{k}=(k_1,\ldots,k_r)\in\Delta^r} f_{\underline{k}} L_{-\varepsilon_1,k_1}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r,k_r} v_\Lambda \pmod{V_{r-1}}$$

as in Claim 1 such that $\sharp\mathrm{Supp}(w)$ is minimal. The claim is equivalent to showing that $\sharp\mathrm{Supp}(w)=1$. Suppose on the contrary that $\sharp\mathrm{Supp}(w)\geq 2$. Let $\mathrm{lt}(w) = f_{\underline{b}} L_{-\varepsilon_1,b_1}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r,b_r} v_\Lambda$. Then $\{1\leq i\leq r \mid k_i\neq b_i, f_{\underline{k}}\neq 0\}$ is not an empty set. Denote $s=\max\{1\leq i\leq r \mid k_i\neq b_i, f_{\underline{k}}\neq 0\}$ and choose $L_{-\varepsilon_1,k_1^*}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_s,k_s^*} L_{-\varepsilon_{s+1},b_{s+1}}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r,b_r} v_\Lambda \in \mathrm{Supp}(w)$ such that $k_s^*\neq b_s$. Note that w has the form

$$\begin{aligned} w \;\equiv\; & f_{\underline{b}} L_{-\varepsilon_1,b_1}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_s,b_s}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r,b_r} v_\Lambda + \\ & f_{\underline{k}^*} L_{-\varepsilon_1,k_1^*}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_s,k_s^*}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r,b_r} v_\Lambda + \text{ other terms} \pmod{V_{r-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $f_{\underline{b}} f_{\underline{k}^*}\neq 0$. Choose $\delta_r\in\Gamma_+$ such that $\max\{\varepsilon_r-\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_{r-1}\}\prec\delta_r\prec\varepsilon_r$ and $b_r(\varepsilon_r-p)\neq(p+\delta_r)(b_r+q)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} w_r \;:=\; & L_{\delta_r,-b_r-q} w \\ \equiv\; & L_{\delta_r,-b_r-q}\Big\{ f_{\underline{b}} L_{-\varepsilon_1,b_1}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_s,b_s}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r,b_r} v_\Lambda + f_{\underline{k}^*} L_{-\varepsilon_1,k_1^*}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_s,k_s^*}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r,b_r} v_\Lambda \\ & + \text{ other terms}\Big\} \pmod{V_{r-1}} \\ \equiv\; & f_{\underline{b}}^r L_{-\varepsilon_r+\delta_r,-q} L_{-\varepsilon_1,b_1}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_s,b_s}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_{r-1},b_{r-1}} v_\Lambda + \\ & f_{\underline{k}^*}^r L_{-\varepsilon_r+\delta_r,-q} L_{-\varepsilon_1,k_1^*}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_s,k_s^*}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_{r-1},b_{r-1}} v_\Lambda + \text{ other terms} \pmod{V_{r-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $f_{\underline{b}}^r f_{\underline{k}^*}^r\neq 0$. Inductively, there exists $(\delta_s,\ldots,\delta_{r-1})\in\Gamma_+^{r-s}$ such that

$$\max\{\varepsilon_{i-1},\varepsilon_i+\delta_{i+1}-\varepsilon_{i+1}\}\prec\delta_i\prec\varepsilon_i \quad\text{and}\quad b_i(\varepsilon_i-p)\neq(\delta_i+p)(b_i+q).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} w_s \;:=\; & L_{\delta_s,-b_s-q} L_{\delta_{s+1},-b_{s+1}-q}\cdots L_{\delta_{r-1},-b_{r-1}-q} w_r \\ \equiv\; & f_{\underline{b}}^s L_{-\varepsilon_s+\delta_s,-q}\cdots\cdots\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r+\delta_r,-q}\, L_{-\varepsilon_1,b_1}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_{s-1},b_{s-1}} v_\Lambda + \\ & f_{\underline{k}^*}^s L_{-\varepsilon_s+\delta_s,k_s^*-b_s-q}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r+\delta_r,-q}\, L_{-\varepsilon_1,k_1^*}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_{s-1},k_{s-1}^*} v_\Lambda + \text{ other terms} \pmod{V_{r-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, choosing suitable $(\delta_1,\ldots,\delta_{s-1})\in\Gamma_+^{s-1}$ and $(k_1',\ldots,k_{s-1}')\in\Delta^{s-1}$ we get another nonzero vector:

$$\begin{aligned} w_0 \;:=\; & L_{\delta_{s-1},k_{s-1}'}\cdots L_{\delta_1,k_1'} w_s \\ \equiv\; & f_{\underline{b}}^0 L_{-\varepsilon_1+\delta_1,b_1+k_1'}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_{s-1}+\delta_{s-1},b_{s-1}+k_{s-1}'} L_{-\varepsilon_s+\delta_s,-q}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r+\delta^r,-q}\varepsilon_\Lambda + \\ & f_{\underline{k}^*}^0 L_{-\varepsilon_1+\delta_1,k_1^*+k_1'}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_{s-1}+\delta_{s-1},k_{s-1}^*+k_{s-1}'} L_{-\varepsilon_s+\delta_s,k_s^*-b_s-q}\cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r+\delta^r,-q} v_\Lambda \\ & + \text{ other terms } (\mathrm{mod}\, V_{r-1}). \end{aligned}$$

In fact, we can require that both $f^0_{\underline{b}} f^0_{\underline{k}^*} \neq 0$ and $0 \prec \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1 \prec \varepsilon_2 - \delta_2 \prec \cdots \prec \varepsilon_r - \delta_r$ hold. At this moment, choose $-p \neq \delta \in \Gamma_+$ such that $\varepsilon_{s-1} - \delta_{s-1} \prec \delta \prec \varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_{s-1} - \delta_s + \delta_{s-1}$, now we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\neq L_{\delta,-q} w_0 \\ &\equiv f'_{\underline{k}^*} L_{-\varepsilon_1+\delta_1,k_1^*+k_1'} \cdots L_{-\varepsilon_{s-1}+\delta_{s-1},k_{s-1}^*+k_{s-1}'} L_{-\varepsilon_s+\delta_s+\delta,k_s^*-b_s-2q} \cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r+\delta_r,-q} v_\Lambda \quad (f'_{\underline{k}^*} \neq 0) \\ &\quad + \text{ other terms} \pmod{V_{r-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $L_{\delta,-q} w_0 \in V_r \setminus V_{r-1}$ and $\sharp\mathrm{Supp}(L_{\delta,-q} w_0) < \sharp\mathrm{Supp}(w)$, contradicting the minimality of $\sharp\mathrm{Supp}(w)$. Hence, $\sharp\mathrm{Supp}(w) = 1$. Finally, using the same arguments as in Claim 1 and choosing suitable $k_1', \ldots, k_r'$, one can assume that $(k_1, \ldots, k_r) \in (\Delta \setminus \{-q\})^r$. Thus our claim holds.

Claim 3. $r \leq 1$. *In fact, there exists some $\pm p \neq \eta \in \Gamma_+$ such that $L_{-\eta,k} v_\Lambda \in S$ for all $k \in \Delta \setminus \{-2q\}$.*

Suppose that $r \geq 2$. By Claim 2, there exists some $0 \neq w \in S$ such that

$$w = L_{-\varepsilon_1,k_1} \cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r,k_r} v_\Lambda + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq l < r \\ 0 \prec (\alpha_1,a_1) \preceq (\alpha_2,a_2) \preceq \cdots \preceq (\alpha_l,a_l)}} g_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}} L_{-\alpha_1,a_1} \cdots L_{-\alpha_l,a_l} v_\Lambda,$$

where $0 \prec \varepsilon_1 \prec \cdots \prec \varepsilon_r$, $(k_1, \ldots, k_r) \in (\Delta \setminus \{-q\})^r$ and $g_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}} \in \mathbb{F}$. Denote $I_0 = \{\underline{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_l) \mid g_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}} \neq 0 \text{ for some } \underline{a}\}$. Let $\lambda = -\sum_{i=1}^r \varepsilon_i$. Fix some $b \in \Delta$, for any $0 \prec \varepsilon \prec \min\{\varepsilon_1, \alpha_1 \mid \underline{\alpha} \in I_0\}$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} L_{-\lambda-\varepsilon,b} w &= L_{-\lambda-\varepsilon,b} \{ L_{-\varepsilon_1,k_1} \cdots L_{-\varepsilon_r,k_r} v_\Lambda + \sum_{\substack{0 \leq l < r \\ 0 \prec (\alpha_1,a_1) \preceq (\alpha_2,a_2) \preceq \cdots \preceq (\alpha_l,a_l)}} g_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}} L_{-\alpha_1,a_1} \cdots L_{-\alpha_l,a_l} v_\Lambda \} \\ &= \left\{ F(-\lambda-\varepsilon) + \sum_{\substack{a_1+\cdots+a_l = k_1+\cdots+k_r \\ \alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_l = \lambda}} g_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}} H_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}}(-\lambda-\varepsilon) \right\} L_{-\varepsilon,b+k_1+\cdots+k_r} v_\Lambda \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{a_1+\cdots+a_l \neq k_1+\cdots+k_r \\ \text{or } \alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_l \neq \lambda}} v_{-\alpha_1-\cdots-\alpha_l-\lambda-\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where each $v_{-\alpha_1-\cdots-\alpha_l-\lambda-\varepsilon} \in V_{r-1}$ is some weight vector with weight $-(\alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_l+\lambda+\varepsilon)$, $F(x)$ and $H_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}}(x)$ are polynomials given as follows:

$$F(x) = \begin{vmatrix} b+q & k_1+q \\ x+p & p-\varepsilon_1 \end{vmatrix} \begin{vmatrix} b+q+k_1 & k_2+q \\ x+p-\varepsilon_1 & p-\varepsilon_2 \end{vmatrix} \cdots \begin{vmatrix} b+q+k_1+\cdots+k_{r-1} & k_r+q \\ x+p-\varepsilon_1-\cdots-\varepsilon_{r-1} & p-\varepsilon_r \end{vmatrix}.$$

$$H_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}}(x) = \begin{vmatrix} b+q & a_1+q \\ x+p & p-\alpha_1 \end{vmatrix} \begin{vmatrix} b+q+a_1 & a_2+q \\ x+p-\alpha_1 & p-\alpha_2 \end{vmatrix} \cdots \begin{vmatrix} b+q+a_1+\cdots+a_{l-1} & a_l+q \\ x+p-\alpha_1-\cdots-\alpha_{l-1} & p-\alpha_l \end{vmatrix}.$$

Since $\deg F(x) = r > \deg H_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}}(x)$, we can find some $\varepsilon \in \Gamma_+$ with $\varepsilon \prec \min\{\varepsilon_1, \alpha_1 \mid \underline{\alpha} \in I_0\}$ such that

$$F(-\lambda-\varepsilon) + \sum_{\substack{a_1+\cdots+a_l = k_1+\cdots+k_r \\ \alpha_1+\cdots+\alpha_l = \lambda}} g_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}} H_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{a}}(-\lambda-\varepsilon) \neq 0 \quad \text{and thereby} \quad L_{-\lambda-\varepsilon,b} w \neq 0.$$

But then a contradiction arises, since $L_{-\lambda-\varepsilon,b}w \in V_{r-1}$. So $r \leq 1$, as desired.

Consider the case $r = 1$. Then by the reduced methods used as in Claims 1 and 2 we may assume that $\sharp\mathrm{Supp}(w) = 1$. Thus, we can choose a nonzero vector of form $L_{-\eta',b}v_\Lambda + fv_\Lambda \in S$, where $\eta' \in \Gamma_+$, $b \in \Delta$ and $f \in \mathbb{F}$. Taking $p \neq \zeta \in \Gamma_+$ and $\pm p \neq \eta \in \Gamma_+$ such that $\eta \prec \zeta \prec \eta'$ and $b(\eta' - p) \neq (\eta' - \zeta + p)(b+q)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}&L_{\zeta-\eta,k+q}L_{\eta'-\zeta,-q-b}\big(L_{-\eta',b}v_\Lambda + fv_\Lambda\big)\\&= (p-\zeta)(k+2q)\big(b(\eta'-p) - (\eta'-\zeta+p)(b+q)\big)L_{-\eta,k}v_\Lambda \in S,\end{aligned}$$

which means $L_{-\eta,k}v_\Lambda \in S$ for any $k \in \Delta \setminus \{-2q\}$. This completes Claim 3.

Now we are ready to prove the first statement. For the case $q \neq 0$, by Claim 3 we have

$$\begin{gathered}L_{\eta,k+q}L_{-\eta,-q}v_\Lambda = (p-\eta)(k+2q)\Lambda(L_{0,k})v_\Lambda \ \text{ for any } k \in \Delta\\ \text{and} \quad L_{\eta,-3q}L_{-\eta,q}v_\Lambda = -4pq\Lambda(L_{0,-2q})v_\Lambda,\end{gathered}$$

which mean $v_\Lambda \in S$ if $\Lambda \neq 0$. Similarly, for the case $q = 0$ one has

$$\begin{gathered}L_{\eta,0}L_{-\eta,k}v_\Lambda = -k(p+\eta)\Lambda(L_{0,k})v_\Lambda \ \text{ for any } \ k \in \Delta \setminus \{0\},\\ \text{and} \quad L_{\eta,1}L_{-\eta,-1}v_\Lambda = 2p\Lambda(L_{0,0})v_\Lambda,\end{gathered}$$

which also force $v_\Lambda \in S$ if $\Lambda \neq 0$. Thus in either case $M(\Lambda, \succ)$ is irreducible. Conversely, it is obvious that

$$M'(0,\succ) = \sum_{\substack{k\geq 1\\ 0\prec(\alpha_1,a_1)\preceq\cdots\preceq(\alpha_k,a_k)}} \mathbb{F}L_{-\alpha_1,a_1}\cdots L_{-\alpha_k,a_k}v_\Lambda$$

is the unique maximal proper $U\big(\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)\big)$-submodule if $\Lambda = 0$. Now suppose that there exists a pair $(x,y) \in \Gamma_+ \times \Gamma_+$ such that $nx \preceq y$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It is easy to verify that

$$W' = \sum_{x\succ z\in\Gamma_+, k\in\Delta} U\big(\mathrm{B}(\Gamma,\Delta,p,q)\big)L_{-z,k}v_0$$

is a submodule of $M'(0,\succ)$, which is proper since $L_{-y,k}v_0 \notin W'$ for any $k \in \Delta$. Conversely, assume that for any $x,y \in \Gamma_+$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $nx \succ y$. Let S' be any nonzero submodule of $M'(0,\succ)$. By Claim 3, there exists some $\eta \in \Gamma_+$ such that $L_{-\eta,k}v_0 \in S'$ for $k \in \Delta \setminus \{-2q\}$. Furthermore, thanks to the density of "$\succ$", we can choose η such that $p \notin \mathbb{N}\eta$. According to our assumption, for any $z \in \Gamma_+$, there exists some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n\eta \succ z$. If $q \neq 0$, then

$$q^{n-1}(p-\eta)\cdots(p-(n-1)\eta)L_{-n\eta,-q}v_0 = [\overbrace{L_{-\eta,0},[L_{-\eta,0},\ldots,[L_{-\eta,0}}^{n-1},\ L_{-\eta,-q}]\ldots]]v_0 \in S',$$

from which we get $L_{-n\eta,-q}v_0 \in S'$. Then we have

$$(p-n\eta)(k+2q)L_{-z,k}v_0 = L_{n\eta-z,k+q}L_{-n\eta,-q}v_0 \in S' \ \text{ for } \ k \in \Delta.$$

Thus, $L_{-z,k}v_0 \in M'(0,\succ)$ for all $z \in \Gamma_+$ and $k \in \Delta \setminus \{-2q\}$. While for $k = -2q$,

$$2q(z-2p)L_{-z,-2q}v_0 = L_{z,-3q}L_{-2z,q}v_0 \in S'.$$

To sum up, $L_{-z,k}v_0 \in S'$ for any $z \in \Gamma_+$ and $k \in \Delta$. We are going to show this also holds for the other case $q = 0$. Assume that the n above is even. On the one hand, by a direct calculation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&(-2)^{\frac{n}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} (p - i\eta) \prod_{j=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} (p - 2j\eta) L_{-n\eta,0}v_0 \\
= \quad &[\overbrace{L_{-\eta,-1}, [L_{-\eta,1}, ..., [L_{-\eta,1}, [L_{-\eta,-1}}^{n-1}, \ L_{-\eta,1}]]...]]v_0 \in S',
\end{aligned}$$

forcing $L_{-n\eta,0}v_0 \in S'$, from which we get

$$(p - n\eta)kL_{-z,k}v_0 = L_{n\eta-z,k}L_{-n\eta,0}v_0 \in S' \ \text{ for } \ k \in \Delta.$$

And we also have

$$(2p - z)L_{-z,0}v_0 = L_{z,1}L_{-2z,-1}v_0 \in S'.$$

So in either case, we have obtained that $L_{-z,k}v_0 \in S'$ for any $z \in \Gamma_+$ and $k \in \Delta$. This implies $M'(0,\succ) \subseteq S'$, proving the irreducibility of $M'(0,\succ)$. □

References

[1] R. Block, "On torsion-free abelian group and Lie algebras ," *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc*. **9**, 613–620 (1958).

[2] D. Ž. Doković, K. Zhao, Some simple subalgebras of generalized Block algebras, *J. Algebra* **192**, 74-101 (1997).

[3] D. Ž. Doković, K. Zhao, "Some infinite-dimensional simple Lie algebras in characteristic 0 related to those of Block," *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **127**, 153–165 (1998).

[4] X. Guo, R. Lü, K. Zhao, "Simple Harish-Chandra modules, intermediate series modules, and Verma modules over the Loop-Virasoro algebra," *Forum Math*. **23**, 1029–1052 (2011).

[5] J. Hu, X. Wang, K. Zhao, Verma modules over generalized Virasoro algebras Vir[G], *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **177**, 61-69 (2003).

[6] Y. Su, C. Xia, Y. Xu, "Quasifinite representations of a class of Block type Lie algebras $B(q)$," *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **216**, 923–934 (2012).

[7] Y. Wu, Y. Su, "Highest weight representations of a Lie algebra of Block type," *Sci. China Ser* A **50**, 549–560 (2007).

[8] X. Xu, "Generalizations of Block algebras," *Manuscripta Math*. **100**, 489–518 (1999).

[9] X. Xu, "New generalizations simple Lie algebras of Cartan type over a field with characteristic 0," *J. Algebra* **224**, 23–58 (2000).